

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: )  
Shunpei Yamazaki, et al. )  
                            )  
Serial No.: 10/664,642    )  
                            )  
Filed: September 19, 2003 )  
                            )  
Examiner: Karla A. Moore )  
                            )  
Art Unit: 1763            )  
                            )  
Confirmation No.: 5083    )  
                            )  
For: FABRICATION SYSTEM AND )  
MANUFACTURING METHOD OF )  
LIGHT EMITTING DEVICE    )

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE (E) AFTER FINAL

Dear Examiner:

Applicants have the following response to the Final Rejection of September 28, 2006 and the Examiner's sole rejection therein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner now rejects Claims 1-6, 19-24 and 29 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsukabi et al. (US 6,696,096) in view of Van Slyke et al. (US publication no. 2003/0015140 A1), Utsugi et al. (US 6,294,892), and Matsuura (EP 0 865 229). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, independent Claim 1 recites that the installation chamber comprises “a transport for transporting said containers into said evaporation source holders in said film formation chamber” (emphasis added). Independent Claim 19 has a similar feature.

The Examiner contends that Tsubaki discloses a transport (54 and 55) for transporting the containers (grooves in 24) into the evaporation source holders (24) in the film formation chamber (1). Applicants respectfully disagree.

As stated above, independent Claim 1 recites a transport for transporting said containers into said evaporation source holders in said film formation chamber. Tsubaki does not disclose or suggest a transport for transporting said containers into said evaporation source holders. For example, the Examiner contends that 54 and 55 are transports and that grooves in 24 in Tsubaki correspond to the claimed containers. However, such an interpretation does not correspond to a transport for transporting containers into the evaporation source holders since the grooves in heating element 24 are not transported into element 24 in the film formation chamber. Hence, independent Claim 1 (and Claim 19 for similar reasons) is not disclosed or suggested by Tsubaki.

As Van Slyke, Utsugi and Matsuura also do not disclose or suggest this feature, independent Claims 1 and 19 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

### Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee is due for this response, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: December 28, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, MCFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.  
200 West Adams Street - Ste. 2850  
Chicago, IL 60606  
(312) 236-8500  
Customer No. 26568